

REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected Claims 22 and 23 as being unpatentable over either the two reference combination of Araki in view of Lorenzo or the two reference combination of Araki in view of Mote. Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 22 and 23 show patentably distinct features that are not shown in any of the references, alone or in combination. Unlike any of the references, Claims 22 and 23 discloses a substantially flat mirror working in conjunction with a lateral-view mirror. Araki, Lorenzo and Mote all utilize a vehicle's standard side-view mirror or standard rear-view mirror in conjunction with another mirror mounted at the rear end of the vehicle. However, this arrangement results in a convex mirror reflecting off of another convex mirror, which leads to a severely distorted image. Without a substantially flat mirror, the Araki, Lorenzo and Mote rear-mounted mirrors must use the reflection of a standard convex rear-view mirror or a standard convex side-view mirror, thus resulting in a distorted image. It is for this reason, that Applicant's invention utilizes a substantially flat mirror mounted on a standard side-view mirror in order to utilize a single convex mirror in the assembly, as opposed to the multiple convex mirrors used in all of the prior art references. There is no suggestion in Araki, Lorenzo or Mote for the use of an additional

substantially flat mirror. Araki, Lorenzo and Mote utilize essentially two-mirror systems (a rear-mounted mirror in combination with either a side-view mirror or a rear-view mirror) whereas Applicant's invention utilizes a three-mirror system (a side-view mirror, a substantially flat mirror and a side-mounted mirror spaced from the rear of the vehicle). Applicant's three mirror system overcomes the disadvantages of the distorted images that result from the prior art references' use of standard convex side-view or standard convex rear-view mirrors. Additional arguments set forth in Applicant's Amendment, dated May 02, 2003, are hereby incorporated by reference.

Applicant respectfully submits that Applicant's claimed invention is deserving of patent protection because it describes in combination, a useful and functional device which patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art. Neither Araki, Lorenzo, Mote or any of the other references cited in previous Office Actions teach a system in which a substantially flat mirror is mounted on a standard convex side-view mirror for the purposes of reflecting substantially undistorted objects lateral to a vehicle from a side-mounted mirror mounted spaced apart from the rear of a vehicle.

In conclusion, Applicant respectfully submits that this Amendment, in view of the Remarks offered herein, is fully

responsive to all aspects of the objections and rejections tendered by the Examiner in the Office Action. Applicant respectfully submits that he has persuasively demonstrated that the above-identified Patent Application, including Claims 22 and 23, is in condition for allowance. Such action is earnestly solicited.

If there are any fees incurred by this Amendment Letter, please deduct them from our Deposit Account No. 23-0830.

Respectfully submitted,



Craig Weiss
Reg. No. 48,274
(480) 994-8888